

5N



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,160	01/23/2004	Robert C. Lyne JR.	P1035.lyne	8161

7590 01/25/2005

Robert C. Lyne, Jr.
10207 Maremont Circle
Richmond, VA 23233

EXAMINER

JIMENEZ, MARC QUEMUEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3726

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/764,160

Applicant(s)

LYNE, ROBERT C.

Examiner

Marc Jimenez

Art Unit

3726

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

- A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 10-19 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 8 and 20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01242004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. **Claim 20** is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 20 should end with a period instead of a semicolon. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. **Claims 1-5, 7, and 9** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bates (US 4,249,657).

Bates teaches a base **13** having a longitudinal axis, at opposite ends of that axis, a rear end **34** and a front, entrance end **35**, a rear wall **34** and side walls **17,21** extending upwardly from the base **13**, a plurality of vehicle supports **11,12** projecting upwardly from the base **13** and being spaced from each other and from the side walls **17,21** so as to define longitudinal channels **23,24** and transverse channels (see between **11** and **12** and between **12** and **35**) for receiving and confining laid-out side chains, respectively, a well (between **11** and **34**) for receiving side chains and cross chains which have not been laid out, an interior wall **16 or 15** defining a compartment

Art Unit: 3726

adjacent the well for receiving and protecting, from damage due to the weight of the vehicle, a U-shaped tool having spaced arms connected to the ends of the side chains. The sloped walls adjacent to **34** in figure 1 could also be considered an interior wall that defines a compartment (see specifically the change in thickness of the wall from **15** to **34** to **19** which defines a compartment). Note that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). The instant invention is drawn to a “tray” apparatus, the “U-shaped tool” is not part of the “tray” apparatus. Therefore, the “tray” structure of Bates is capable of performing the intended use of receiving and protecting a U-shaped tool.

Regarding claim 2, the wall defining the compartment is considered “sufficiently high”.

Regarding claims 3-4, the compartment is defined by a plurality of interior walls as discussed above.

Regarding claim 5, the side walls **17,21** are considered to have a “height sufficient to contain side chains”.

Regarding claim 7, the side walls **17,21** have a relatively greater height defining the well **32** and a relatively lesser height near the supports **11,12**. The side walls are relatively greater in height compared to the well and a relatively lesser height compared to the supports.

Regarding claim 9, note the chain element holder **30**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claim 6** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates in view of Douglas et al. (US 3,845,875).

Bates teaches the invention cited with the exception of having stacking lugs and stacking recesses.

Douglas et al. teach stacking lugs 16 and stacking recesses (above 16 in figure 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided the invention of Bates with stacking lugs and stacking recesses, in light of the teachings of Douglas et al., in order to be able to stack multiple trays for storage and shipping purposes.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. **Claims 10-20** are allowed.


7. **Claim 8** is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Contact Information

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc Jimenez whose telephone number (571) 272-4530. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday between 5:30 a.m.-2:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on (571) 273-4530. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Marc Jimenez
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3726

MJ
January 24, 2005